

May 15, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5491

TABLE 8.—“Dairy products: Sec. 22 quotas and milk equivalent (fat basis), July 1, 1965–June 30, 1966

[In pounds]

“Product	Quota	Milk equivalent
<b>Cheese:</b>		
Italian type.....	11,500,100	91,770,798
Edam and Gouda.....	9,200,400	69,739,032
Blue-mold.....	5,016,999	45,604,521
Cheddar.....	3,706,800	36,326,040
Total.....	28,497,599	243,440,991
<b>Other products:</b>		
Butter oil.....	11,200,000	32,325,000
Butter.....	707,000	15,235,850
Dried buttermilk.....	496,000	709,280
Dried whole milk.....	7,000	61,460
Malted milk.....	6,000	15,900
Dried cream.....	500	9,300
Dried skim milk.....	1,807,000	-----
Articles containing 45 percent or more of butter-fat.....	None	-----
Total.....	(2)	48,346,780
Total milk equivalent of quotas.....	(2)	291,787,771

\*1 Allocated on a calendar year basis.

\*2 Not meaningful.

“NOTE.—Milk equivalents calculated from information obtained from U.S. Department of Agriculture”.

## CONGRESSMAN J. HERBERT BURKE SEEKS PROTECTION FROM FOREIGN IMPORTS FOR FLORIDA FARMERS

(Mr. BURKE of Florida (at the request of Mr. BROZMAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Federal Government is spending vast sums of money to improve the circumstances of many Americans, it is simultaneously, through its import policies, threatening the livelihood of others engaged in agricultural labor.

I am especially concerned about the situation in my own State of Florida where unregulated imports of foreign goods such as Mexican tomatoes and foreign oranges are posing an economic threat to south Florida farmers and citrus growers.

Two bills introduced by our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] (H.R. 478 and H.R. 479) are designed to rectify this condition and to make the Federal Government more responsive to the true need of the American people. The changes outlined in these proposals are needed to aid our entire American economic community and labor forces against the threat of low priced foreign imports. As the able subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. Dent has performed a valuable service in introducing these measures and in holding a series of hearings on them. I fully support this legislation and am therefore today introducing companion bills as a measure of my interest and strong support.

One bill would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so that the Secretary of Labor could, at the request of the President, the Congress, or by other application, undertake to study and report upon the effect of imports on a particular

industry. The objective is to afford maximum protection to economic welfare of domestic workers through Presidential action following the Secretary's report. The second bill, a possible alternative to the first, also would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to require the Secretary of Labor to investigate the effect of foreign competition on domestic employment.

While the proposed legislation will be beneficial to all segments of domestic industries, I feel it will be especially helpful in the field of agriculture. A recent report of the Department of Agriculture states that agricultural imports in 1966 showed a 10-percent increase over 1965. The main reason for the overall increase is that importation of supplementary commodities rose 17 percent. Over the last decade the inflow of supplemental products, that is, those which are produced in this country and hence are competitive, have continually increased. Noncompetitive products have been imported in decreasing quantities during the same period.

But while these figures are significant, such statistical generalizations tend to ignore the human impact in specialized segments of agriculture. Unseen in the cold figures showing tomato imports increasing from a value of \$30 to \$52 million are the shrinking returns of vegetable farm operators and workers. And the imports of oranges which were valued at \$3.5 to \$4 million the last 2 years also have had a serious effect on our domestic citrus fruit industry.

The legislative remedy discussed here would not interfere with our thriving international agricultural trade unless it can be shown that American workers are being deprived of their opportunity to earn an honest living. Should they be so deprived, then it is our responsibility as their Representatives in Congress to find, to provide, and then to insure adequate and effective remedies in their behalf.

Mr. DENT's subcommittee has more hearings on these proposals scheduled this month. I am extremely hopeful that favorable action will be taken by the subcommittee and subsequently by the full committee, and that this vitally needed legislation will soon be brought to the floor of the House of Representatives for the serious consideration and approval of my concerned colleagues.

## TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK

(Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. BROZMAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 the Boston College Club of Washington paid tribute to the distinguished Speaker of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, by naming him outstanding alumnus and Man of the Year. Among those in attendance was William H. Sullivan, Jr., president of the Boston Patriots. Because Mr. Sullivan's own tribute to the Speaker expresses so much of what we all feel, I would like to in-

clude in the Record, Mr. Sullivan's letter to Speaker MCCORMACK dated May 5, 1967:

THE BOSTON PATRIOTS  
FOOTBALL CLUB,  
Boston, Mass., May 5, 1967.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Congress of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In several decades of attending testimonial dinners I can't ever recall an evening which was so moving as the warm tribute paid so justifiably to Mrs. McCormack and you by the Boston College Club of Washington. The entire evening was filled with deep sentiment but everyone present was convinced that there is still place in our way of life for a man who believes strongly in God and whose fine character is reflected in the progress of the nation and, indeed, of the entire world.

President Johnson's remarks highlighted the occasion for almost everyone present, but much as I enjoyed them I think it was even more thrilling to see the stature of the manner in which you expressed your deep convictions and magnificent philosophy which has guided you through life. You certainly honored Boston College by your presence, but what is far more significant and important you honored our faith and the faith of all who believe that our Maker is really on our side when we are right.

It may interest you to learn that people of all ages thoroughly enjoyed the evening. At our table we had some youngsters, some middle-aged folks, and a few elder citizens. The feeling of all was unanimous. It was an historic occasion, the memory of which will never be erased by the passage of time.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. SULLIVAN, JR.

*ABM*  
SENATORS RAIL LAG ON MISSILE  
DEFENSE

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. BROZMAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in February and March of this year, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held secret hearings on the issue of the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system, and apparently we are no closer to resolving the controversy than we were 3 years ago. Meanwhile, the Soviets have deployed an ABM system around Moscow and other areas, putting them ahead of the United States in this field. In contrast, this Nation is exploring the possibility of an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union which, presumably, would eliminate any necessity for our deploying an ABM system.

A recent statement by the Soviet Union's Defense Minister, Marshal Andrei Grechko, is especially interesting in view of our eagerness to reach an agreement concerning the ABM systems. On May 9, 1967, Grechko stated:

The imperialists should know that the soviet people will not hesitate to use the entire force of their arms against the enemies of socialism in order to severely punish those who try to push mankind into the abyss of a new war.

The 50-year history of the Communist movement proves that Grechko is deadly serious. Time and time again the Soviets have butchered human beings when they

H5492

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 15, 1967

were militarily at an advantage. Now, with regard to the ABM systems, the Soviets have forged ahead while for 3 years we have ignored the warnings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and responsible Members of Congress that it is urgent that we immediately begin work on an ABM system.

I sincerely hope that this issue comes up for close scrutiny during the 1968 presidential campaign. Perhaps the voters will indicate that an ounce of preventive security is worth more than a warehouse of agreements with an avowed enemy.

Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune reported the latest development in this 3-year controversy of the ABM system in the May 10, 1967, issue of the Tribune. I request that his article, along with the article, "Soviet Defense Chief Tells of Buildup," from the Chicago Tribune of the same date be inserted in the Record at this point:

SENATORS RAP LAG ON MISSILE DEFENSE  
(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, May 9.—"This is a frightening world," remarked Sen. Albert Gore [D., Tenn.].

It was becoming more so all the time, agreed Cyrus Vance, deputy secretary of defense.

"What we are doing is guessing that they [the Russians] won't do something because we hope they won't do it," said Sen. Stuart Symington [D., Mo.]. "But they may have started doing it already."

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, agreed that this was a fairly accurate estimate of the situation. He added, grimly, that he hoped the guessing period would not be prolonged until the balance of power in favor of the United States was lost.

CENSOR MOST PAGES

These exchanges took place at secret sessions of the Senate foreign relations committee in February and March. The testimony was released today in declassified form. Pentagon censorship was revealed on almost every page with the notation "deleted," causing hundreds of gaps in the record.

The committee had held seven days of closed hearings in an attempt to probe a mystery of three years' duration—the refusal of President Johnson and Robert S. McNamara, secretary of defense, to heed the urgings of the joint chiefs of staff and Congress for immediate deployment of a defense against long-range nuclear missiles.

MAY SAVE 80 MILLION LIVES

The published record provided no answer to the puzzle. Vance, presenting McNamara's views, insisted that the cost of the system [ranging as high as an estimated 40 billions] was excessive in relation to its effectiveness.

"You're pursuing a war in Viet Nam costing 30 billions a year," Symington reminded Vance. "I can't understand why a missile defense system, which may save 80 million lives, is opposed because of its 40 billion cost over a period of years."

Vance said "a truly effective defense" was impossible. Russia, which has deployed an antiballistic missile system around Moscow and in other areas has "wasted billions of dollars" on its missile defense system, he asserted.

COULD NO LONGER DETER

Gen. Wheeler disagreed. The joint chiefs of staff have been unanimous for at least two years in recommending deployment of the Nike-X missile defense system, he said. He flatly outlined the peril he saw in permitting Russia to have such a defense when the United States had none.

"Should the Soviets come to believe that their missile system, coupled with a nuclear attack on the United States, would limit damage to the Soviet Union to a level acceptable to them, our forces would no longer be able to deter them and the first principle of our security policy would be gone," he said.

The Nike-X system has been developed to a stage where it can definitely save tens of millions of American lives against an enemy nuclear strike, Wheeler said, and its immediate deployment was essential.

Why were the President and McNamara, then, delaying? Wheeler said he understood the President first wanted to explore with the Soviet Union "the possibilities of arms control."

QUIZ RUSK ON DELAY

Dean Rusk, secretary of state, a later witness, was asked how long the United States would wait for Russia to agree to drop its missile defenses.

"We are deferring a final decision [on deployment of the Nike-X] until we can find out where we are in our discussions with the Soviet Union," he said.

"Have you ever known a time in recent history that the Soviets have agreed to anything that stood in the way of their attaining equality or superiority over the United States?" asked Sen. Bourke B. Hickenlooper [R., Ia.].

"Broadly speaking, the answer is no," Rusk conceded.

COMPARE MISSILE STRENGTHS

The hearings produced bulky evidence on fatalities in a nuclear strike; on the potentialities of Communist China as a nuclear foe; and on the comparative missile strengths of the United States and Russia [we have a 3 to 1 superiority in numbers but theirs are far bigger].

Gore's remarks about "a frightening world" were based on statements about the ease with which nuclear bombs could be dropped in American harbors by ships with false bottoms.

The committee was assured that the United States could overwhelm with a shower of missiles any defense system set up by Russia. But no witness could explain Russian insistence on building a costly missile defense system which was not truly effective.

Sen. Frank J. Lausche [D., O.] kept asking a simple question: "If it is good for them, why isn't it good for us?"

He didn't get an answer.

SOVIET DEFENSE CHIEF TELLS OF BUILDUP

Moscow, May 9 [Reuters].—The Soviet Union's defense minister Marshal Andrei Grechko, today said Russia is building up its military force in the face of what he termed American escalation of the war in Viet Nam and the "growing arrogance" of West Germany.

The marshal made his statement on the day marking Russia's observance of the 22d anniversary of the end of World War II.

The occasion was used by the Kremlin for a repetition of its long-standing claim that Russia played the decisive role in defeating both Nazi Germany and Japan in 1945.

A PUBLIC HOLIDAY

The day was a public holiday, marked by a 30-gun artillery salutes in Moscow and other major cities.

Grechko, in an article in Pravda, the Communist party newspaper, said the present tense international situation required constant vigilance by Soviet armed forces.

"The imperialists should know that the Soviet people will not hesitate to use the entire force of their arms against the enemies of socialism in order to severely punish those who try to push mankind into the abyss of a new war," he wrote.

On Viet Nam, he said the Communists there will continue to get inviolable fraternal

support from Russia and other communist nations.

"APPRECIATES" ALLIED ROLE

Grechko said Russia "duly appreciates the contribution of the United States and British armies in the battles of World War II, but it was the Soviet people who bore the brunt of the war against Hitler's Germany."

"It is also beyond dispute that the Soviet armed forces played a decisive part in defeating imperialist Japan," he said.

He said Western claims that the war was finally decided in North Africa and Italy were "absurd" and "vicious" inventions.

(Mr. KUFFERMAN (at the request of Mr. BROTZMAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KUPFERMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ACCURACY IN BUSINESS ACT

(Mr. DENNEY (at the request of Mr. BROTZMAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which is calculated to put the legislative process on a more businesslike basis.

As my colleagues know, our rules of parliamentary procedure are in part based upon "Jefferson's Manual."

Mr. Jefferson stated concerning his manual:

But I have begun a sketch, which those who come after me will successively correct and fill up, till a code of rules shall be formed . . . the effects of which may be accuracy in business, economy of time, order, uniformity, and impartiality.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the reason that Mr. Jefferson listed "accuracy in business" first in his listing of the reasons for his rules was that he considered it of primary importance. I concur. An intelligent choice by definition presupposes being fully informed on alternatives. In my short span of service in this body, I have been extremely concerned about the lack of financial information available to us at the time that we vote upon a particular bill. For that reason, I am today introducing H.R. 9966 and House Resolution 476.

H.R. 9966 will require the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to submit to both bodies, on or before the 15th day of each month, an adjusted estimate of anticipated revenues and expenditures of the Federal Government for the balance of the fiscal year. The budgets that are presented to us in January are based upon a number of assumptions. Within a very short time a number of these assumptions prove inaccurate thus making the budget inaccurate. Through this bill, it is my hope that at the time we vote on legislation which will require expenditures from the Federal Treasury, we will have up-to-date and accurate information as to the current financial status.

House Resolution 476 would amend the rules of the House to provide the following:

First. That each bill or resolution introduced in the House must contain an